



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,319	10/16/2003	Jin Wang	LAHA 9-2-11	8497
50525 7590 09/02/2008 DUFT BORNSSEN & FISHMAN, LLP 1526 SPRUCE STREET SUITE 302 BOULDER, CO 80302				
EXAMINER				
DAVENPORT, MON CHERI S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2616				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/02/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Continuation sheet**

**Continuation of 11.**

Request for consideration does not place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

In the remarks on pg. 8, the applicant contends that Sigler does not teach or suggest "a base station system"

Examiner respectfully disagrees Sigler teaches in a satellite network system which provides the capability for mobile earth terminal to access or more multiple beam satellites located in geostationary orbit for the purposes of providing mobile communication services ( see Sigler col. 1, lines 45-49). The NCC in the satellite system provides the functions (used for communication with mobile devices) and reads on broad language of the claimed base station system.

In the remarks on pg. 8, the applicant contends that Sigler does not teach or suggest "determines if the call signaling is for a low latency service"

Examiner respectfully disagrees Sigler teaches a mobile user request a channel on a Push-To-Talk basis, the mobile user is alerted by a tone when the channel is available, receiving a request and responding reads on a determination being made if the call signaling is for low latency services( Push-To-Talk) see col. 16-17, lines 61-6. The base FES manages the contention on the communication channel, which the FES interact and accept real-time control from the NCC (see col. 2, lines 56-62).

In the remarks on pg. 9, the applicant contends that Sigler does not teach or suggest “processing the received call signaling to determine if it is for low latency service”

Examiner respectfully disagrees the claim language does not state “processing the received call signaling to determine if it is for low latency service” As this limitation argued is more specific than what is presented in the current claim language that states “responsive to receiving call signaling from a mobile wireless device, determines if the call signaling is for a low latency service”

/Mon Cheri S Davenport/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2616  
August 18, 2008